

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner very much for the constructive assistance and suggestions he offers to provide pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j) in the Office Action mailed 1999, July 28. The Examiner can counts upon full cooperation from applicant in order to place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible.

OA issues #1 and #2

Subject matter of claims 12-15 is disclosed page 14, lines 13-38 in the substitute specification filed 09/05/95 and from page 29, line 10 to page 30, line 7 in the original specification. Drawing(s) showing the subject matter of these claims will be added to existing drawings.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 (b), applicant requests that objections and requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of claims 1-18 be held in abeyance until allowable matter is definitely indicated in these claims.

OA issues #3 and #5

Applicant is amenable for the most to the changes the Examiner proposed in the independent claims 1, 2 and 16 and has rewritten these claims accordingly except on a small but important point. Applicant would like to keep claimed the possibility of having only one out of the two arms provided with an elastic buffer as it was specified in the original description, page 5, line 18, page 6, line 13, page 20, lines 3-4, page 21, line 5, page 23, lines 25-26, and accordingly shown in Fig. 1.

This can be still found page 2, line 38, page 3, lines 22-23, page 9, lines 4-5 and line 39, page 11, line 9 in the substitute specification filed 09/05/95 and still shown in Fig.1. That covers in particular the case where one of the arms is a flat worktable with a tranverse hole in which the support part is disposed. The support part carries another arm to which is secured a springy buffer and the worktable is not overlaid with a springy material. As in this case the clamping force is manually exerted only on the back of the arm equipped with said springy buffer, a precise tactile perception of the gradualness of the clamping is still provided. Indeed this perception is coming from the use of this kind of buffer when there is no amplification means or substitute means for getting the clamping force. So this embodiment of the invention as defined by claims 1-2 and 16 still produces the new and unexpected result such as made evident from page 4, line 15 to page 5, line 17, in applicant's amendment letter filed 3/29/99. And with the capability of the contact face of the springy buffer to substantially conform to the surface of an irregularly shaped object, such an embodiment of the invention as defined by claims 1-2 and 16 achieves, on the side where the springy buffer is, the new and unexpected result of avoiding any pressure peak, as it is shown page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 22 in amendment submitted by applicant on 03/29/99. On the other hand, the worktable affords great stability. Through combining an enhanced stability and aforementioned new and unexpected results, this embodiment of the invention as defined by claims 1-2 and 16 can clamp things that could not be clamped otherwise, such as for model

making a fragile and flat vertical stabilizer or an upper wing in equilibrium against a fuselage or a fragile and flat keel against an overturned hull, even if both fuselage and hull are round-shaped and slippery, or for musical instrument making a violin bow in equilibrium upon its back. Such a capability is another new and unexpected result. All these advantages of this single-buffer embodiment of the invention over the prior art militated in favor of the attainment of the commercial success at HIA show of Las Vegas (see exhibit #3 cited page 6, bottom paragraph, of applicant's amendment letter filed 3/29/99). That is a reason why such an embodiment has been selected as the subject of the usually first out of nine pictures to be looked at (the top left one) on the most illustrated side of the brochure (see exhibit #4 cited page 6, bottom paragraph, in applicant's amendment letter filed 3/29/99) published by Zona Tool Company, the distributor of the clamps according to the invention for hobby in North America. It is reminded that Zona Tool Company is a parent company to Foredom which participated in the HIA show and sent aforementioned exhibit #3 as a fax-letter. Such an embodiment is further the subject of three pictures, pictures E, H and O of the magnificent brochure of LMI about the clamps according to the invention (see exhibit #8 cited page 7, top paragraph, of applicant's amendment letter filed 3/29/99). The Examiner is requested with deference to review the above amendment of independent claims 1, 2 and 16, made according to his suggestions just a bit widened to claim more completely the submitted invention. Upon receiving the Examiner's comments about this point, definitive version of said claims could be submitted and work for amending the remainder of the claims to put them in condition of allowance could begin. It is believed that wording adopted to amend these claims should be helpful to correct errors in the specification.

OA issue #6

Each of the references (Posch, Foerster or Foerster) cited in the OA as a prior art made of record discloses clamping jaws which contact difficult shapes only on a limited number of separated and parallel line segments. Therefore the clamping force is concentrated upon a limited number of quasinull-area surfaces, that is to say globally upon a tiny area. As by definition the pressure equals the ratio of the clamping force to the covered area, that gives a very high pressure located to the line segments, that is to say pressure peaks along these segments. That further evidences that the invention as defined by claims 1-18 provides a new and unexpected result as it avoids any pressure peak when difficult-shaped surfaces are clamped (see from page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 22 in paper submitted by applicant on 03/29/99).

On the other hand, each of these references utilizes, of course, a means such as a lever associated with a screw to greatly amplify the hand strength for getting the clamping force or a lever associated with a spring to replace the hand strength by a substitute to make the clamping force. That gives the hand a loose perception or no perception at all of the gradualness of the clamping. As a result, there is no precise tactile perception of the gradualness of the clamping which the invention as defined by claims 1-18 provides as a new and unexpected result (see from page 4, line 15 to page 5, line 17 in amendment

submitted by applicant on 03/29/99).

But if the object of these references of the twenties of this century was to conform to difficult shapes, the fact that they succeeded only to contact articles in a discrete way is an additional evidence that the invention as defined by claims 1-18 solves a long-felt, long-existing but unsolved need.

Conclusion and Further Request for Constructive Assistance

Every ground of rejection has been responded to in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.111 and only amendments complying with 37 C.F.R. 1.116 (a) are submitted. Hence favorable reconsideration is petitioned with deference.

By this response to the Office Action mailed 1999, July 28, applicant hopes to have submitted the elements the Examiner was looking for to provide applicant further constructive assistance pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j).

Very Respectfully

Philippe BERN

Philippe Berna, Applicant Pro Se

Mailing address: Mas Liotard - Les Brousses, F30410 Molières-sur-Cèze,
France (Phone: (33) 490 85 90 81, Fax: (33) 490 85 90 81)

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper of six pages including this one is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Philippe Berna

Philippe BERN
Signature

10/27/99
Date